

Remarks & Arguments

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 1-32 are pending in the application, and that Claims 1-32 are rejected. By this amendment, Claims 1, 6-8, 10-19, 26 and 32 have been amended, Claims 20-25 have been canceled without prejudice, and Claim 43 has been added. Thus, Claims 1-19, 26-32 and 43 are pending in the application. The amendments to the claims do not add new matter to the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Objection to Specification

The specification stand objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent bases for the claimed subject matter. The objection is rendered moot in light of the amendments to Claims 1, 10, 20 and 26.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102 and 103

Claims 1 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Chen and Hoare. The rejection alleges that Chen teaches a circuit for time stamping events, the circuit comprising node controller 38, which read on an event stream distributor coupled to receive the primary event stream (38 receiving 44, Fig 1). Applicant respectfully asserts that the node controller is not equivalent to the event stream distributor. Chen teaches that the node controller: coordinates the internal operation of node 16 (col. 7, lines 24-25); incorporates several internal processing functions, including the event data acquisition

function (col. 7, lines 43-46); essentially funnels both the data and control signals from one internal node bus to another. These message transfers may require different protocols and circuits ... to perform the digital processing necessary to transfer data and control signals from one protocol to another (col. 7, lines 49-54). As depicted in Figure 2, the node controller 38 disclosed in Chen comprises a node bus protocol, an internode protocol, ECC and RAM protocol, and capture logic (col. 7, line 54 through col. 8, line 25). Chen also teaches that the internal data/control bus 44 is for transferring messages and control signals (col. 7, line 39; col. 7, line 67 through col. 8, line 1). On the other hand the event stream distributor receives an event stream not a plurality of data and control signals from a bus 44. The event stream distributor distributes events in the primary event stream among a plurality of secondary event streams. The event stream distributor as disclosed comprises an input buffer, initialization circuits, counters, and pass gates. The event stream distributor does not include a node bus protocol, an internode protocol, ECC and RAM protocol, and/or capture logic. In addition, the required and necessary functions of the node controller 38 as disclosed by Chen are not required or necessary to the function of the event stream distributor, in fact the event stream distributor as disclosed does not provide such functions. Furthermore, the event stream is nothing more than a single stream of multiple signal level transitions (e.g., events), it is not a combination of data and control signals (e.g., information).

The rejection further alleges that Chen teaches a plurality of timestamp circuits (Col. 8, lines 6-13, Col. 11, lines 43-45, lines 53-55), each timestamp circuit coupled to receive a respective secondary event stream from the event stream distributor (38 distributing second

event, Fig 1). Applicant has amended Clams 1 and 10 to include the limitation that the events in the primary event stream are apportion among a plurality of secondary event streams. The disclosure of the claimed invention is more accurate described by the use of apportioning as opposed to distributing. To the extent that distributing can be interpreted broadly to mean simply delivering, those skilled in the art appreciate, from the circuit and accompanying timing diagrams in the disclosure of the present application, that the events are divided and allocated proportionally (e.g., sequentially) among the plurality of secondary event streams. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that even if the data and control signals received by the node controller are equivalent to the primary event stream, the capture logic is not coupled to receive a respective secondary event stream. Chen discloses that a given capture logic of a node receives all the events of all the signals delivery on the internal data/control bus 44. The events on the internal data/control bus are not apportioned.

Thus, Claims 1 and 10 are patentable over Chen, Hoare and any combination thereof. Furthermore, Claims 2-9 and 11-19 are dependent upon Claims 1 and 10, respectively, and incorporate all the limitation therein. Therefore, Claims 2-9 and 11-19 are patentable over Chen, Hoare and any combination thereof for the same reasons advanced in support of Claims 1 and 10. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-19 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Adelman and Hoare. With regard to Claims 1 and 10, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Adelman nor Hoare teach or suggest that the event stream distributor

apportions events in the primary event stream across a plurality of secondary event streams.

Accordingly, Claims 1 and 10 are patentable over Adelman, Hoare and any combination thereof. Furthermore, Claims 2-5 and 11-14 are dependent upon Claims 1 and 10, respectively, and incorporate all the limitations therein. Hence, Claims 2-5 and 11-14 are also patentable over Adelman, Hoare and any combination thereof for the same reasons advanced in support of Claims 1 and 10. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-5 and 10-14 is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-32 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Fransson and Hoare. Claim 26 has been amended to include the limitation that the events of the signal are apportioned among the outputs of the first plurality of gates as a function of the respective control signal from the first counter. Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Fransson nor Hoare teach or suggest the added limitation. Accordingly, Claim 26 is patentable over Fransson, Hoare and any combination thereof. Furthermore, Claims 27-32 are dependent upon Claim 26 and incorporate all the limitation therein. Hence, Claims 27-32 are also patentable over Fransson, Hoare and any combination thereof for the same reason advanced in support of Claim 26. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 26-32 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is

Appl. No. 10/056,287
Amdt. Dated October 29, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 29, 2004

invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 23-0085. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eric J. Gash", written over a horizontal line.

Dated: October 29, 2004

Eric J. Gash
Registration No. 46,274
Tel.: (408) 938-9060